

BY FULTON & PRICE, PROPRIETORS.
A. FULTON, Editor...A. L. PRICE, Associate Editor
Price of Subscription:
One year, invariably in advance, \$2.50
When payment is not made in advance, \$3.00
No subscription received for less than one year.
No subscriber permitted to discontinue his paper after the commencement of a subscription year, till the expiration of said year.
Any subscriber wishing his paper discontinued at the end of the year, must pay up in full and give the proprietors two weeks notice, otherwise the paper will be continued and charged for to the end of the year.
Any person sending us five new subscribers, accompanied with the advance subscription, (\$12.50), will receive the sixth copy gratis, for one year.
Registered Letters, containing money for this paper, at our risk.
All letters on business connected with this office, must be addressed (post paid) to the proprietors.

Professional and Business Cards.

DENTIST!
J. H. FREEMAN, having bought out Dr. A. H. Dyer, offers his services to the citizens of Wilmington and the surrounding country, as practical DENTIST.

All operations performed by him warranted to give entire satisfaction. FRONT STREET.

Oct. 10th, 1856. 30-8w-15tf

J. A. L. CORBETT,
INSPECTOR OF NAVAL STORES.

WILMINGTON, N. C.
All business in his line thankfully received and prompt
[July 14, 1856.-44-6s]

JAMES C. HOWDEN,
INSPECTOR OF NAVAL STORES.

WILMINGTON, N. C.
April 4, 1856.-43-1s

N. F. HOUDEAUX,
INSPECTOR OF NAVAL STORES AND PROVISIONS.

Wilmington, N. C. The subscriber having been elected Inspector of Naval Stores and Provisions, the Town of Wilmington, N. C., will give prompt attention to all business in that line entrusted to him.

Dec. 22, 1854.-16tf

N. F. BOURDEAUX.

GEO. W. ROSE,
CARPENTER AND CONTRACTOR,

WILMINGTON, N. C.
Jan. 17

S. M. WEST,
CUTTER AND COMMISSION MERCHANT.

WILMINGTON, N. C.
219-1s

JAMES M. STEVENSON,
AGENT FOR THE SALE OF ALL KINDS OF PRODUCE.

PRINCE STREET, UNDER ADAMS, BRO. & CO.,
WILMINGTON, N. C.
Feb.-56tf

JOSEPH L. KEEN,
CONTRACTOR AND BUILDER, respectfully informs the public, that he is prepared to take contracts in his line of business. He keeps constantly on hand, Lime, Cement, Plaster, Plastering Kiln, Philadelphia Press Bricks, Fire Brick.

N. To Distillers of Turpentine, he is prepared to
sell at the shortest notice. [May 20, 1854.-37-1y]

WILLIAM R. DRAPELT, and Dealer in
Paints, Oils, Drapery, Window Glass, Garden Seeds,
Perfumery, Patent Medicines, &c., &c., corner of Front and
Market street, immediately opposite Shaw's old stand, WIL-
MINGTON, N. C.

W. H. MCKOY,
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DEALER AND FOR-
WARDER, AND COMMISSION MERCHANT,
SOUTH WATER STREET, 6 doors below Market.

Particular attention paid to the sale of Naval Stores
and other produce.

Liberal advances made on consignment.

MCALEB & BUNTING,
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DEALERS IN GRO-
CERIES AND PROVISIONS.

No. 32 NORTH WATER STREET,
WILMINGTON, N. C.

Orders from the country will receive prompt attention.
March 20.

H. H. HARBAUGH,
Architect, Superintendent and Contractor of
IRON RAILING FOR CEMETERIES, &c.

Also, furniture and parts complete, all kinds of CAST
IRON RAILING FOR CEMETERIES, &c.

Plans for buildings drawn and sent to all parts
of the country. Orders through the Post Office will receive
prompt attention.

Wilmington, N. C., April 25.-34-1y.

LAW NOTICE.

DE BRUTZ CUTLAR,
MESSRS. SMITH & CUTLAR, Attorneys at Law, will
henceforth occupy an office directly opposite the Court
House in Wilmington, and practice in co-partnership in the
name of De BRUTZ CUTLAR.

A. R. SMITH will inform his clients in the adjoining coun-
ties, that Mr. Cutlar will act for him whilst absent on the
trial, and can always be found at the office.

July 25, 1856.-44-1s

THOS. B. CARR, M. D. D. S.
PRACTICAL DENTIST for the last ten
years, your charges for
each, \$10 or less artificial teeth on fine gold plate,
\$15.00
An entire set of teeth on fine gold plate,
\$15.00
Ditto on gold, with artificial gums,
\$15.00
Ditto on Platina plate, with artificial gums,
\$15.00
Upper or under dito, each,
75.00

A fine gold filling, warranted permanent,
5.00
and destroying the nerve,
\$3 to \$5.00
Extracting a tooth,
50cts to 1.00
Best dentifrices and tooth powders, always have every
operator warranted to give entire satisfaction. Teeth

The Victoria Bridge at Montreal a Great Work. A correspondent of a Pittsburgh paper gives the following account of the Victoria Bridge now being built at Montreal to connect various railroads in that country and the United States: "The Victoria Bridge where it is to cross the St. Lawrence, is two miles in width. The current is very rapid, and the water from four to ten feet in depth along where the piers are to be erected, is deep in the main channel, where it is from thirty to thirty-five feet deep. In the winter the ice reaches to a great thickness, and piles up with deep snow, under which the waters have to wear their way on to the ocean. Spring comes; the vast bodies of snow which have collected in all the river basin melt and pour into the common receptacle. The floes and boulders of ice are driven up in vast piles thirty and forty feet in height, through which the water rous and boils and surges, driving them onward at a fearful rate and crushing all before them. As far as the eye can see, the man, still alive, wanders from place to place in agonized dread from the wrath to come. A third legend adds that this wandering Jew falls sick every hundred years, but recovers and renewes his strength; hence it is that even after so many centuries he does not look much older than a septuagenarian. Thus far the legends. Not one of the ancient authors makes even mention of such an account. The first who reports some such thing is a monk of the thirteenth century, when, as is known, the world was filled to disgust with pious fictions. However, the story has spread far, so that it has become a proverb, 'He runs like a wandering Jew.' There are not wanting persons who assert to have even seen the wanderer. But when their evidence is examined by the test of historical credibility, it is found that some impostor had made use of this false to impose upon simple-minded people for some purpose of his own. The legend is not altogether untrue; there is a wandering Jew who roves about Europe, throughout every country. This imperishable being is—providence against the Jews.—*Jesus' Chronicle.*

The New York Day-Book and the Slave Trade. The New York *Day-Book* is one journal, at least, published in the North that is willing to acknowledge that ours is a Government of white men; that the negro is a negro, and must continue to be a negro while grass grows and water runs; and it is, therefore, in favor of his always occupying the normal relation between him and the white man, which is that of subordination or servitude. It is logical as well, too, and does not stop half way in defending negro slavery, and stultify itself by pronouncing the African slave trade as inhuman, like Albert Pike, or "shocking to the moral sentiments of the enlightened portion of mankind," like the tender-hearted Mr. Etheridge, of Tennessee. On the contrary, it considers the prohibition of the slave trade, in its present form, insulting to the South and disgraceful to the American intellect. In a late article, reviewing Mr. Etheridge's resolution, it thus sums up the beneficent results of African slavery in the United States: "Thus when honestly looking at the facts involved in this matter—the transformation of millions of rude, useless, semi-bestial savages into useful and happy Christians—the cultivation of vast and fertile regions, otherwise, of necessity, barren deserts—the growth and production of staples that constitute the basis of modern commerce and are absolutely essential to modern civilization, and, greatest of all, the development of Democratic ideas springing from that peculiar social condition termed 'slavery,' and the existence of a class called slaveholders, the Jeffersons and Jacksons, the men unrivaled and unapproached in true statesmanship, who, bound together by the common interests of production, have defended the negroes of labor for the toiling millions, and made a Democratic system an actual fact—in view of these things, these transcendent results—these beneficent consequences—this mighty good—the African 'slave trade' and 'American slavery' constitute the happy conjuncture of circumstances that has ever occurred in human affairs. Nor are these beneficent consequences, or any of them, the result of these general laws of Providence, which overruling the ignorance or wickedness of mortals, bring good out of evil. On the contrary, it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right and the restriction was wrong."

What Extravagance is done, and what Economy might do. The following extract is not too long to be read before breakfast. There is a great deal of truth, good, sound, wholesome truth, in it. We copy from the Boston Traveller:

After all, it may be that the prosperity of the country is really mostly endangered by the extravagance which pervades too many all ranks of society in proportion to their means. Luxury and profusion have been the downfall of as many nations as the civil strife. In numberless instances, the fruits of our untiring industry and indomitable enterprise are squandered with a wasteful hand. Notwithstanding the vast amount of products which we export, the balance of trade is always against us, and we are continually in debt, as a nation. The people of Europe look with astonishment at the extravagant expenditure of the men and women from the United States, who make the tour of that continent. We are the most profitable customers of the fabricants of costly articles of luxury all over the world. The vendors of such goods come to our shores and make their fortunes out of us, in the same manner that needy purveyors gather around the heirs of a rich estate. Our market is the principal one for all costly and showy, but fragile and unsubstantial merchandise, upon which the largest profits are realized by the manufacturers. In the furnishing of our houses, and in female attire, we go far beyond the most wealthy classes of Europe. If our staples of export are not an actual loss, then the balance of trade is wrong. We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

The *Day Book* says, in conclusion, however, that it is not an advantage of the re-opening of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

We believe the *Day Book* is an advocate of free trade in general. We presume that it is in favor of the slave trade, and "cannot conceive any possible condition or circumstance that would demand or warrant its renewal." We have regarded the revival of the slave trade as an open question of expediency; but we have contended for the right to discuss it as such, and regret to see a journal, usually so ready to meet all questions, either of morality or expediency, dismissing this one with its own *ipse dixit*, that under no conceivable circumstances would the revival of the slave trade be expedient. If the slave trade was expedited to the time it was prohibited by act of Congress, and denounced as piracy about fifty years ago, it is not to the imagination to conceive that it may be expedited to revive it? Then, how does the *Day Book* reconcile its opinion as to the side he would take in the removal of the slave trade with its previous assertion, that "it is a demonstrable truth that bringing negroes from Africa was right, and the restriction was wrong?" Now, what prevents the slave trade? The restriction imposed by Congress. Should this restriction be removed? Yes, says the *Day Book*, for it "was wrong" to impose it. Is not removing the restriction upon the slave trade equivalent to re-opening it, or at least permitting it?

THE WILMINGTON JOURNAL.

WILMINGTON, N. C., MONDAY, JAN. 5, 1857.

The Cape Fear and Deep River Navigation and the Fayetteville and Western Railroad.

We regret to find in the last *North Carolinian* a bitter attack upon the Cape Fear and Deep River Improvement. We do not pretend to say that something has not been wrong about that work. That it has been the victim of miscalculation, mismanagement—misanything you please, we suppose must be admitted; at any rate, it is not denied. We have done our best to stir up those interested to find out exactly where the wrong is, so that we cannot be accused of acting under desire to have anything smothered up or concealed.

But that is one thing. Hostility to the work is another; and that hostility to the work, per se, does exist, is perfectly evident from the tone of the article in the *Carolinian*. There is no mistaking the *animus* of that article.

Now this is deeply to be regretted. With the private feelings of men or bodies of men towards this or that work we have nothing to do; at any rate, we have nothing now to say. It is their own business. This we will say, however, that the worst way in the world to promote your own interests is to make attacks upon the interests of others. The worst way in the world to secure the passage of any appropriation for the Coal Mine Road, is through attacks upon the Deep River Improvement, as an improvement, and this we suppose has something to do with the "slashing" criticism of the latter work by the *Carolinian*. It may be thought that the navigation stands somewhat in the way of the road, and that if the former were knocked in the head, the latter would be bound to "go through." We think this is a somewhat mistaken idea.

Let us not be misunderstood. We are for cloaking over nothing in connection with the river. Our course has shown that. We are in favor of a road to the Coal Mines, as we have honestly avowed a dozen times, although the *Observer* will have it that we are aiming "side-slows," etc., at the latter work, in all which the *Observer* is very much mistaken. We are really friendly to the work—we really believe also that the Cape Fear and Deep River can be made available, and that it ought not to be abandoned at this late time of the day.

There is no question that the original estimate for the river improvement were ridiculously inadequate. That ought to have been evident from the very beginning, to any engineer familiar with such work. There is as little doubt that great loss has resulted from the cobbled system of underestimating, by which system of mistaken economy, work was only half-done, and experience shows that work so done had better never been touched. We admit this, but amid all the fusses and confusions, the fact remains, and is now manifest, that for an adequate sum to do the work well, the work can be well done, and that so done, the money expended will be well bestowed.

The London Times pronounces President Pierce's message "as, on the whole, conciliatory both in matter and manner."

The re-assembling of the Congress of Paris is fixed for the 25th of December. It was believed that the adjournment concerning the Isle of Serpents and Bologna would be arranged beforehand.

The quarrel between Spain and Prussia had gone so far that it was feared the next step would be open hostility.

Milano, who attempted to assassinate the King of Naples, had been hung.

63—Nett amount in U. S. Treasury on the 22d ult. \$22,012,212 58.

63—The report of the Inspector of Flour at Fayetteville, shows the number of barrels inspected there during the year just closed to have been 13,167, a decrease from the inspections of the preceding year of 5,549.

63—The accounts by the Steamer Fulton say that Spain and Prussia are likely to go to war. Why should Spain and Prussia go to war? They have no common aspirations and therefore no rivalries. Their territories don't touch each other at any point, and they have, neither of them, either navies or shipping trading with negroes. Mr. Bonhary, bill concerning State bonds. Mr. Houck, a substitute for a bill introduced by him, concerning placing obstructions on Railroads. This bill enacts that any person convicted of placing obstructions on Railroads, shall receive thirty-nine lashes; but if loss of life or limb occur, he shall suffer death.

The following bills were read the second time, and the rules were suspended, passed their third reading:

A bill to lay off a road to the town of Marshall, in Madison county. A bill to authorize Plank Road and Turnpike Companies to use stone and gravel in the repairs of their roads.

Mr. Slaughter moved a message to be sent to the Senate, proposing to enter into an election for Attorney General, to supply the vacancy caused by Mr. Bachelor's resignation. Objection was made, the House voted—ays 35, nays 19.

The Speaker stated that there was no quorum present. Mr. Love moved a call of the House, which was adopted. Ayes 31, nays 20. Pending the call, Mr. Baxter moved a suspension, when the Speaker decided the House could transact no business, and declared the House adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

RALEIGH, Jan. 1st, 1857.

SENATE.—Mr. Hill introduced a bill to incorporate the town of Yancey.

Mr. Jenkins, a bill to alter the County line between Surry and Ashe County.

The following bills passed their third reading:

A bill to incorporate Jonathan's Creek Turnpike Company. A bill concerning the examination of miners in certain cases.

A bill to lay off a new County by the name of Alieghany was made the order of the day for Thursday next.

The bill to prevent the felling of timber in Eno and other rivers, passed its second reading.

The bill requiring those suing rail-road Companies, to give notice to the President, was lost on its second reading, also, a bill for the benefit of creditors of deceased insolvents.

The bill to incorporate the North Carolina Gas and Transportation Company, passed its second and third readings.

A message was received from the House proposing to enter on the election of Attorney General to fill the unexpired term of J. B. Bachelor, which he concurred in. Mr. Hill nominated W. H. Bailey of Orange.

Mr. Wilder introduced a bill to incorporate the Raleigh Savings Institution.

A message was received from the House with a bill to amend the charter of the Fayetteville and Western Plank Road Company, with an amendment. Which was concurred in.

A bill to incorporate the Town of Rockingham, Richmond County, passed its second and third reading.

The bill to amend the act incorporating the Bank of Wilmington, with three amendments, passed its second reading.

A bill to extend the charter of New Garden Boarding School, was read the second and third time and passed.

A bill to incorporate the Warrenton Female College, was read second time, and at a later period passed its third reading with an amendment by Mr. Elton.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—The following bills were introduced, read the first time, and referred to appropriate Committees:

Mr. Love, a bill to enlarge the powers of the Trustees of Greenhill Female Academy. Mr. Rumley, a bill to amend the 36th sec. 85th cap. of the Revised Code, concerning Pilots. Mr. Scales, a bill to amend 36th sec. 7th chap. of the Revised Code, concerning Asylums. Mr. Rushing, a bill to discharge unjust and malicious prosecutions. Mr. Elliott, a bill to charter Mount Olive Academy, Randolph County.—Mr. Eller, a bill to aid in the construction of a public road in Wilkes County. It appropriates \$300 for that purpose.

Mr. Slaughter renewed his motion of yesterday, concerning the election of Attorney General, which being adopted, a message was accordingly sent to the Senate.

The following bills were read the second time, and the rules being suspended, they were read the third time and passed: A bill to prevent obstructions to the passage of fish in Noyet River. After a bill of remonstrance from Mr. Stiles the bill passed. On motion of Mr. Houck, the bill appointing a special Magistrate for Rowan County, resident in Salisbury, to inquire into the expediency of amending the 107th chap. of the Revised Code concerning slaves, and repealing thereof necessary.

Mr. Stiles' resolution relative to daily sessions from 9 to 12 o'clock. Mr. Jenkins moved to amend by inserting a bill to incorporate the Town of Rockingham, Richmond County, passed its second and third reading.

The bill to amend the act incorporating the Bank of Wilmington, with three amendments, passed its second reading.

A bill to emancipate a slave of Daniel Shaver was lost—ays 8, nays 25.

A number of bills were informally passed over.

The Senate then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Mr. Withers offered a resolution, requesting the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the expediency of amending the 107th chap. of the Revised Code concerning slaves, and repealing thereof necessary.

Mr. Stiles' resolution relative to daily sessions from 9 to 12 o'clock. Mr. Jenkins moved to amend by inserting a bill to incorporate the Town of Rockingham, Richmond County, passed its second and third reading.

The bill to amend the act incorporating the Bank of Wilmington, with three amendments, passed its second reading.

A bill to increase the salary of Secretary of State, was rejected; yeas 32, nays 70.

The bill to provide for the better security of costs in cases of ejection, passed its second reading.

On motion of Mr. Caldwell, a message was sent to the Senate, appointing 3 o'clock Saturday next for the election of Magistrates.

On motion of Mr. Settle, the bill from the Senate concerning the registration of Coupon Bonds, was passed through its second and third readings.

Mr. Gilliam's bill permitting Judges and Lawyers to solemnize marriages was indefinitely postponed.

A number of bills were read and left on the table for further action.

The House then adjourned.

The Reception of the Officers of the Resolute.

The Arctic discovery ship Resolute, recovered by an American whaling ship and presented to the British nation by the United States Congress, arrived at Spithead (as heretofore stated) on the 12th ult., under the command of Capt. Hartstein, of the U. S. Navy.

On the morning of the 13th, Capt. Hartstein landed at Portsmouth, and paid official visits to Chevalier Pappalardo, the United States vice consul, and the military and civil authorities. An invitation to a public banquet, by the Corporation and inhabitants of Portsmouth, with amendments.

Mr. Parks introduced a series of resolutions authorizing a survey of the Northwestern Railroad, the Governor to employ the requisite engineers.

Mr. Fowle, a bill to incorporate the Male and Female Academy in Swansboro.

Mr. Gorham's bill to incorporate the Greenborough Hotel Company.

Mr. Clarke's bill to repeal the act locating the Judges of the Superior Courts.

The bill relative to the currency of the State was made the order of the day for Tuesday next.

The bill to incorporate the Danville and Greenboro' Railroad Company was read the second time, and made the order of the day for Wednesday next.

The bill concerning the improvement of certain rivers in Sampson county was made the order of the day for Monday next.

A bill to amend the charter of Jonathan's Creek Turnpike Company passed its second reading.

The bill to repeat the act fixing the dividing line between Chatham and Alamance was indefinitely postponed.

The bill to authorize the examination of mines in certain cases passed, its second reading.

The bill to make railroad companies responsible for the killing of cattle, stock, &c., by locomotives, was read the second time. Mr. Wiggins advocated the bill. He thought it right and proper the road should pay. The Wilmington road paid nothing; the Gaston only half. Mr. Wilder explained, when the accident is unavoidable the road pays half, when it is the result of carelessness the road pays full value and charges the engineer. Mr. Eason opposed the bill, which was laid on the table.

Mr. Coleman introduced a bill to establish the competency of Universalists, and others, to take the usual oaths.

The House then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Mr. Waugh from the committee to superintend the election of Attorney General reported Mr. Baily duly elected.

Mr. Stiles offered a resolution that the House shall sit each day in session from 10 to 3 o'clock.

Mr. Stiles said his object was to get rid of evening and night sessions. Mr. Jenkins gave notice that he would move to amend by inserting from 9 to 2 o'clock.

Under the rules the resolution lies over one day.

Mr. Green offered a resolution authorizing the State Geologist, under the direction of the Governor, to transmit a collection of the minerals of this State to the Patent Office.

The following bills were introduced, read the first time and appropriately referred:

Mr. Baxter, a bill to increase the Revenue of the State. This bill imposes a tax of one per cent on Bank dividends and profits, provided the tax does not reduce the profits less than 6 per cent. Mr. Gilliam, a bill to repeal the 8th sec. 81st chap. of the Revised Code, concerning Albemarle Sound and its tributaries. Mr. Pickett, a bill to amend the charter of the Chapel Hill.

S. L. FREMONT.

Eng. & Sup't.

P. S.—This statement is made in reference to the running as compared with the time tables and instructions therein, and has no reference to the action of the Board of Directors last night, as I have not yet seen the view they take of it, but it is made to justice to myself.

S. L. F.

The Supreme Court.

The session of the Supreme Court commenced in this city yesterday, Judges Nash, (Chief Justice) Pearson and Battle on the bench. There were 26 applications to practice in the county Courts of this State, as Attorneys and Counsellors at Law, all of whom, after a proper examination of their qualifications by the aforesaid Judges, were admitted to the bar. They are as follows:

Wm. Thompson of Chowan county; Richard A. McLaughlin of Iredell; Col. W. M. Hardy, of Buncombe; E. W. Gilliam, of Oxford; R. H. Broadhead, of Rowan; J. Kerr, of Mecklenburg; J. C. Hitecock, of Davidson; Allen Jordan, of Montgomery; Wm. K. Watson, of Bertie; J. E. Short, of Washington; Richard H. Battle, Jr., of Chapel Hill; Joshua Warre White, of Perquimans; Julian Turner, of Hillsborough; John A. Stanly, of New Hanover; Clement Dowd, of Carthage; J. B. Slaughter, of Hertford; F. C. Moore, of New Bern; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; N. H. Fennell, of N. Hanover; M. Cowles of Yadkin; O. R. Rand, of N. Carolina; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D. M. Furchee, of Davie; J. A. Faison, of Sampson; J. N. Stalling, of Duplin; S. Blue, of Richmond; and for the Superior Courts: Thos. C. Fuller, of Fayetteville; Jesse J. Yeates of Mufford; J. M. Taylor, of Robeson; J. M. Taylor, of Person; John Williams, of E. City; A. Moore, of Moore; G. Goldsborough; M. S. Robins, of Randolph; D